

BOB DOLE
1ST DISTRICT, KANSAS

243 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
AREA CODE 202
225-2715

COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

DISTRICT OFFICE:
210 FEDERAL BUILDING
HUTCHINSON, KANSAS 67501

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

COUNTIES:

BARBER	HODGEMAN	RAWLINS
BARTON	JEWELL	RENO
CHEYENNE	KEARNY	REPUBLIC
CLARK	KINGMAN	RICE
CLOUD	KIOWA	ROOKS
COMANCHE	LANE	RUSH
DECATUR	LINCOLN	RUSSELL
EDWARDS	LOGAN	SALINE
ELLIS	MADE	SCOTT
ELLS WORTH	MITCHELL	SEWARD
FINNEY	MORTON	SHERIDAN
FORD	NESS	SHERMAN
GOVE	NORTON	SMITH
GRAHAM	OSBORNE	STAFFORD
GRANT	OTTAWA	STANTON
GRAY	PAWNEE	STEVENSON
GREELEY	PHILLIPS	THOMAS
HAMILTON	PRATT	TREGON
HARPER		WALLACE
HASKELL		WICHITA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCTOBER 11, 1966

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Members of the Kansas Congressional delegation have directed a letter to Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, emphasizing the desire of farmers in Sherman and Wallace Counties to increase sugar beet production.

Congressman Bob Dole, spokesman for the delegation, pointed out that the contents of the letter to Secretary Freeman were of significance. If additional sugar beet acreage is made available to Sherman, Wallace and other counties in that area, there is a possibility Great Western Sugar Company would build a sugar beet plant in Kansas. Great Western announced last week plans to build a plant either in Kansas or Colorado and "of course," Dole said, "the Kansas delegation would welcome construction on a Kansas site."

The text of the letter to Secretary Freeman is as follows:

Honorable Orville Freeman
Secretary of Agriculture
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The undersigned members of the Kansas Congressional delegation wish to submit the following comments in connection with the Sugar Beet proportionate Share Hearings held in Denver, Colorado, September 22, 1966, in accordance with Section 302 of the Sugar Act, to determine if there may be a need to establish proportionate shares for the 1967 crop.

Sugar beet production is extremely important to Western Kansas, and many farmers having both the capability and desire to produce beets are prevented from doing so due to the small acreage allotments or total proportionate shares available to them. Many farmers, particularly in Sherman and Wallace Counties, who operate farms ideally suited to beet production and who have an abundance of water available for this purpose, should, in our opinion, be afforded the opportunity to engage in the production of beets.

It has been estimated that as high as 50,000 acres of the 113,500 acres assigned to localities having commitments from the national sugar beet acreage reserve for the 1965 and 1966 crops have not been planted. It is estimated that nearly 15,000 acres in sugar allotments in three states -- Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska -- have no prospect of being used in those states. We recommend, therefore, that these "dead acreages" or a significant portion of them be assigned to Kansas (subject to the willingness of a processor to contract for such acreages).

We wish to point out further that we believe serious consideration should be given to the transfer of acreage allotments across state lines in those instances where acreage for a processing plant may otherwise be inadequate to maintain economic and efficient plant operation. Records indicate that from 20 to 30 thousand acres of the total allotment for Colorado have been unplanted the last few years, part of which would have been used by Kansas producers had transfer across state lines of allotments within a processing plant district been possible.

House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515
-2-

Many have recommended the alternative that proportionate shares should not be established for the 1967 crop and have presented facts and figures based on the estimated carry-over on January 1, 1968, to support their argument. This viewpoint was forcefully presented by Mr. Guy Manuel, president of the Spreckels Sugar Company, who presented testimony on behalf of 14 leading sugar processors at the Denver hearings, and we feel it deserves appropriate consideration. The world situation and the war in Viet Nam tend to lend validity to this argument, and we consider this to be a reasonable alternative.

We respectfully request these recommendations be given careful consideration in establishing subsequent sugar beet proportionate share determinations.

Sincerely yours,

/FRANK CARLSON
U. S. Senator

/BOB DOLE, M. C.
1st District, Kansas

/JAMES B. PEARSON
U. S. Senator

/CHESTER L. MIZE, M. C.
2nd District, Kansas

/ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, M. C.
3rd District, Kansas

/GARNER E. SHRIVER, M. C.
4th District, Kansas

/JOE SKUBITZ, M. C.
5th District, Kansas

The undersigned members of the Congressional delegation wish to submit the following comments in connection with the Sugar Beet Proportionate Share Hearings held in Denver, Colorado, September 12, 1966, in accordance with Section 302 of the Sugar Act, to determine if there may be a need to establish proportionate shares for the 1967 crop.

Sugar beet production is extremely important to Western Kansas, and many farmers having both the capability and desire to produce have not been able to do so due to the small acreage allotments or total proportionate shares available to them. Many farmers, particularly in Sherman and Wallace Counties, who operate farms ideally suited to beet production and who have an abundance of acreage available for this purpose, should, in our opinion, be afforded the opportunity to engage in the production of beets.

It has been estimated that as high as 20,000 acres of the 113,500 acres assigned to localities having commitments from the national sugar beet storage reserve for the 1965 and 1966 crops have not been planted. It is estimated that nearly 15,000 acres in sugar allotments in these states -- Nebraska, South Dakota, and Nebraska -- have no prospect of being used in those states. We recommend, therefore, that these "dead acreage" or a significant portion of them be assigned to Kansas (subject to the willingness of a processor to contract for such acreage).

We wish to point out further that we believe serious consideration should be given to the transfer of acreage allotments across state lines in those instances where acreage for a processing plant may otherwise be inadequate to maintain economic and efficient plant operation. Records indicate that from 10 to 30 thousand acres of the total allotment for Colorado have been unplanted the last few years, part of which would have been used by Kansas producers had transfer across state lines of allotments within a processing plant district been possible.